

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/807,723

Applicant(s)

DANIELL ET AL.

Examiner

Anne R. Kubelik

Art Unit

1638

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anne R. Kubelik.

(3) Guy T. Donatiello.

(2) Henry Daniell.

(4) James E. Bauersmith.

Date of Interview: 15 October 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Maliga et al, Blowers et al, Kota et al, Daniell et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner gave Applicant a copy of the FAOM that will be mailed by the Office this week. Applicant urges that Blowers et al is not enabled and that the application was withdrawn - one of the inventors on that application is currently working in his lab; Applicant will submit a Declaration by this person to this effect. Applicant urges that the uniqueness of the instant invention is recognized by his peers (e.g., by publication in Nature Biotech, etc). Applicant urges that the spacer regions are what makes their invention enabled and non-obvious over the prior art. Applicant urges that Kota et al in view of Daniell et al is a suggestion to try.